

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 11-13 and 16-23 are pending in the application, with claims 11, 16 and 23 being independent. Claims 11 and 16 are amended. No claims are canceled. Support for claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure at least at pages 17-21.

Claim Rejections under §101

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. For the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant's attorney has amended claim 11.

Claim 11 recites "a processor-readable medium comprising processor-executable instructions configured for..." The Office argues that it is not clear that the instructions cause a computer to execute the recited steps. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interests of expediting allowance of the application, claim 11 is amended, as discussed during the interview, to recite "[a] processor-readable medium comprising processor-executable instructions that, when executed on one or more processors, perform acts comprising..." Applicant

understood the Examiner to agree that this amendment overcomes the §101 rejection. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this indication. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §101 rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under §103(a)

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 6,944,539 (hereinafter, “Yamada”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,266,295 (hereinafter “Parker”).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Parker.

Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Parker in view of U.S. Publication Number 2004/0124977 (hereinafter “Biffar”).

Claims 19-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Parker in view Biffar and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,321,158 (hereinafter “DeLorme”).

Claims 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Parker in view Biffar and DeLorme and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,790,974 (hereinafter “Tognazzini”).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office’s rejections, Applicant has amended the independent claims.

Independent claim 11, as amended, recites a processor-readable medium comprising processor-executable instructions that, when executed on one or more processors, perform acts comprising:

- receiving scheduling information including event times, event locations, and event details;
- accessing a map that encompasses the event locations
- for each event location, expressing event times in a single illustrated clock face; and
- displaying each clock face on the map at its corresponding event location;
- receiving a user input instruction from a cursor hovering over an event time in the single spatial view; and
- in response to the user input instruction, displaying a pop-up pane containing underlying event information associated with the event time.

The Office argues that the subject matter of claim 11 is obvious over Yamada in view of Parker. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interests of expediting allowance of the application, independent claim 1 is amended to recite that the one or more processors perform acts comprising “receiving a user input instruction from a cursor hovering over an event time; and in response to the user input instruction, displaying a pop-up pane containing underlying event details and

event locations associated with the event time.”

Yamada is directed to “an information display system including an input device that inputs a scheduled event, a schedule storage in which the schedule is stored, a display device that displays a map, a memory that stores map information and the scheduled event, and a controller that displays a schedule reminder message on the map at a specified time before the scheduled event is to occur.” (Yamada, Abstract) Yamada, however, does not teach “receiving a user input instruction from a cursor hovering over an event time; and in response to the user input instruction, displaying a pop-up pane containing underlying event details and event locations associated with the event time.”

Parker, meanwhile, is directed to “a system and method [to] provide an event display” that “includes an analog clock face representation having a contrasting portion indicating a time of the event.” (Parker, Abstract) Parker, however, has not been shown to teach “receiving a user input instruction from a cursor hovering over an event time; and in response to the user input instruction, displaying a pop-up pane containing underlying event details and event locations associated with the event time.”

Accordingly, independent claim 11 is believed to be allowable over Yamada and Parker whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined).

Dependent claims 12 and 13 depend from independent claim 11 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 11, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Independent claim 16, as amended, recites a method comprising:

- expressing multiple event times on a single analog clock face;
- wherein the clock face includes an inner circle depicting active AM hours in which event times may occur, a first concentric ring around the inner circle depicting active PM hours in which event times may occur, a second concentric ring around the first concentric ring, the second concentric ring depicting time markings consistent with an analog clock, and event hands extending from the center of the inner circle to the outer edge of the second concentric ring, each event hand designating a particular minute in an analog clock hour, wherein the event occurs at the particular minute for every active AM hour and for every active PM hour ~~an active hour on which an event will occur.~~

The Office argues that the subject matter of claim 16 is obvious over Parker. Without commenting on the propriety of the rejection, Applicant herein amends independent claim 16.

Parker is directed to “a system and method [to] provide an event display” that “includes an analog clock face representation having a contrasting portion indicating a time of the event.” (Parker, Abstract) Parker, however, has not been

shown to teach or suggest: “each event hand designating a particular minute in an analog clock hour, wherein the event occurs at the particular minute for every active AM hour and for every active PM hour,” as discussed during the interview. During the afore-mentioned interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree.

Accordingly, independent claim 16 is believed to be allowable over Parker whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined).

Dependent claims 17-22 depend from independent claim 16 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 16, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

New Claim

Independent claim 23 is added. For at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 16, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 stands allowable. For instance, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references have not been shown to teach or suggest at least the following:

- expressing AM hours in which an event can occur on each clock face as an inner circle partitioned into an AM event-on section and an AM event-off section;
- expressing PM hours in which an event can occur on each clock face as a first ring surrounding the inner circle, the first ring partitioned into a PM event-on section and a PM event-off section;

- *expressing an event time on each clock face as a clock hand extending radially away from the center of the inner circle in a direction which expresses **a particular minute** in an analog clock hour;*
- *wherein the event occurs **at the particular minute** for every hour of the AM event-on section and every hour of the PM event-on section*

Claim 23 (emphasis added).

During the afore-mentioned interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree. Furthermore, Applicant notes that new claim 23 corresponds to original dependent claim 12. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that any subsequent Office Action (other than a Notice of Allowance) should remain Non-Final. See 37 CFR § 1.113, MPEP § 706.07(a).

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, **Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any remaining issues.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: September 9, 2008

By: /Dale G. Mohlenhoff/
Dale G. Mohlenhoff
Reg. No. 37,683
(509) 324-9256 x238

Robert G. Hartman
Reg. No. 58,970
(509) 324-9256 ext. 265